UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/637,174	08/07/2003	Petre Dini	50325-0780	2931

29989   7590   12/12/2007

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER
PATEL, HARESH N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
 Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 September 2007</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-47* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-47* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-47 are subject to examination.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 9/24/07, have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. The applicant's amendment to the claims also alter the scope of the claimed subject

matter, which is addressed by the below rejections.

3.   For clarification, the statement, "the amendments to the claims were made to improve the

readability and clarity of the claims and not for any reason related to patentability" is incorrect,

for example, see amended claim 1.

4.   Regarding, the applicant's concerns for specifying state transitions for a component

including composite transitions, ...,. See, e.g., Kirti at col. 8, lines 36-48 ("criteria may include

specified minimums, maximums, averages, etc."). For at least the foregoing reason, Kirti does

not disclose every element of independent Claim 1. Reconsideration is respectfully requested,

spontaneously generate notifications when specified states and state transitions occur involving

the network component the teachings of the cited references are not limited to as asserted by the

applicant in fact, when reviewing a reference the applicants should remember that not only the

specific teachings of a reference but also reasonable inferences which the artisan would have

logically drawn therefrom may be properly evaluated in formulating a rejection. **In re Preda,**

401 F. 2d 825, 159 USPQ 342 (CCPA 1968) and In re Shepard, 319 F. 2d 194, 138 USPQ

148 (CCPA 1963). Skill in the art is presumed. In re **Sovish, 769 F. 2d 738, 226 USPQ 771**

(Fed. Cir. 1985). Furthermore, artisans must be presumed to know something about the art apart

from what the references disclose. **In re Jacoby, 309 F. 2d 513, 135 USPQ 317 (CCPA 1962).**

The conclusion of obviousness may be made from common knowledge and common sense of a

person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference.

In re Bozek, 416 F.2d 1385, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969). Every reference relies to some

extent on knowledge of persons skilled in the art to complement that which is disclosed therein.

In re Bode, 550 F. 2d 656, 193 USPQ 12 (CCPA 1977).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6.   Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kirti et al.,

7,7076,543 (Hereinafter Kirti).

7.   Referring to claim 1, Kirti discloses a method for capturing illegal and undesired

behavior for network components and for interactions between components (e.g., col., 4)

comprising: specifying state and state transitions for a component (e.g., col., 8), wherein

specifying includes specifying composite state transition (e.g., col., 7); and when a particular component or interaction between a particular two or more components enters a particular state or state transition, generating a notification corresponding to the particular state or state transition wherein the particular state or state transition is one of the one or more states or state transitions (e.g., col., 8).

8.   Referring to claim 2, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein the one or more states are specified based on thresholds (e.g., col., 5).

9.   Referring to claim 3, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein the notification is an event (e.g., col., 4).

10.   Referring to claim 4, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein the particular component or interaction between the particular two or more components is a component (e.g., col., 4), and wherein the step of generating the notification comprises generating the notification by the component (e.g., col., 4).

11.   Referring to claim 5, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses wherein the particular component or interaction between the particular two or more components is an interaction between components (e.g., col., 4), and wherein the notification is generated by at least one of the particular two or more components (e.g., col., 4).

12.   Referring to claim 6, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

reporting the notification to a network management system (e.g., col., 5).

13.   Referring to claim 7, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

detecting that the particular component or interaction between the particular two or more

components has entered the particular state or state transition (e.g., col., 5); and wherein said

notification is generated in response to said step of detecting (e.g., col., 5).

14.   Referring to claim 8, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

the step of detecting is performed by an agent (e.g., col., 4).

15.   Referring to claim 9, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses the

agent is a dedicated agent (e.g., col., 4).

16.   Referring to claim 10, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

polling the particular component or the particular two or more components to determine that the

state or state transition has occurred (e.g., col., 7).

17.   Referring to claim 11, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

wherein the particular state or state transition is an illegal or undesired state (e.g., col., 6).

18.   Referring to claim 12, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

wherein the step of specifying one or more states and state transitions comprises specifying

undesired states (e.g., col., 6).

19.   Referring to claim 13, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

wherein the step of specifying one or more states and state transitions comprises specifying

illegal states and undesired states (e.g., col., 6).

20.   Referring to claim 14, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

wherein detecting whether a state or state transition has occurred comprises determining whether

a component or component interaction has entered an illegal or undesired state (e.g., col., 6).

21.   Referring to claim 15, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

wherein an authorization violation and an authentication forgery are defined as illegal states

(e.g., col., 6).

22.   Referring to claim 16, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

wherein a sudden QoS degradation is defined as an undesired state (e.g., col., 6).

23.   Referring to claim 17, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

examining multiple notifications to deduce one or more trends regarding the network (e.g., col.,

6).

24.   Referring to claim 18, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

wherein the step of examining multiple notifications comprises examining notifications for

stable-behavior in a threshold value for a particular trend (e.g., col., 6).

25.   Referring to claim 19, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

wherein the step of examining multiple notifications comprises examining notifications for

increases or decreases in a threshold value for a particular trend (e.g., col., 6).

26.   Referring to claims 29 through 47, please refer to the rejections of the above-rejected

claims 1-19 for the rejections and the references. Kirti also discloses a computer-readable storage

medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions for capturing illegal and undesired

behavior for network components and for interactions between components, which instructions,

when executed by one or more processors, cause the one or more processors to carry out the

steps.

27.   Referring to claim 20, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

a computer based system for capturing illegal and undesired behavior for network components

and for interactions between components (e.g., col., 4), the system comprising: a network

component, each network component configured to spontaneously generate notifications when

specified states and state transitions occur involving the network component wherein the

specified state and state transitions (e.g., col., 6), include composite state transition (e.g., col., 6);

and a network management system configured to receive said spontaneously generated

notifications (e.g., col., 8).

28.   Referring to claim 21, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

an agent configured to detect the generation of notifications by the network components (e.g.,

col., 4), and configured to report detected notifications to said network management system (e.g.,

col., 4)

29.   Referring to claim 22, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

a state table configured to store said specified states and state transitions, including composite

state transitions (e.g., col., 4).

30.   Referring to claim 23, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

wherein the state table is in a network management system (e.g., col., 4).

31.   Referring to claim 24, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

wherein the state table is in a network component (e.g., col., 4).

32.   Referring to claim 25, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

wherein the agent is further configured to examine condition of a network component and to

query the state table to determine whether the condition represents an illegal or undesired state

(e.g., col., 4).

33.   Referring to claim 26, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

wherein the agent is further configured to examine a transition relating to a network component

and to query the state table to determine whether the transition represents an illegal or undesired

transition (e.g., col., 5).

34.   Referring to claim 27, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

a system for capturing illegal and undesired behavior for network components and for

interactions between components (e.g., col., 4) comprising: a network component; an agent

configured to examine said network components to determine whether specified states, including

composite state transitions (e.g., col., 7), have occurred, wherein the agent is configured to

generate notifications upon a determination that a specified state has occurred (e.g., col., 4), and

wherein the agent is configured to report detected notifications to said network management

system (e.g., col., 4); and said network management system configured to receive reports of said

generated notifications (e.g., col., 8).

35.   Referring to claim 28, Kirti discloses the claimed rejected as above. Kirti also discloses

a state log configured to store said specified states and state transitions, including composite state

transitions (e.g., col., 6).

36.   Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moran et al.,

6,801,940 (Hereinafter Moran).

37.   Referring to claim 1, Moran discloses a method for capturing illegal and undesired

behavior for network components and for interactions between components (e.g., col., 2)

comprising: specifying state and state transitions for a component (e.g., col., 4), wherein

specifying includes specifying composite state transition (e.g., col., 6); and when a particular

component or interaction between a particular two or more components enters a particular state

or state transition, generating a notification corresponding to the particular state or state

transition wherein the particular state or state transition is one of the one or more states or state

transitions (e.g., col., 4).

38.   Referring to claim 2, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses wherein the one or more states are specified based on thresholds (e.g., col., 44).

39.   Referring to claim 3, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses wherein the notification is an event (e.g., col., 2).

40.   Referring to claim 4, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also ·

discloses wherein the particular component or interaction between the particular two or more

components is a component (e.g., col., 2), and wherein the step of generating the notification

comprises generating the notification by the component (e.g., col., 2).

41.   Referring to claim 5, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses wherein the particular component or interaction between the particular two or more

components is an interaction between components (e.g., col., 2), and wherein the notification is

generated by at least one of the particular two or more components (e.g., col., 2).

42.   Referring to claim 6, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses reporting the notification to a network management system (e.g., col., 44).

43.   Referring to claim 7, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses detecting that the particular component or interaction between the particular two or

more components has entered the particular state or state transition (e.g., col., 44); and wherein

said notification is generated in response to said step of detecting (e.g., col., 44).

44.   Referring to claim 8, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses

the step of detecting is performed by an agent (e.g., col., 2).

45.   Referring to claim 9, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses the agent is a dedicated agent (e.g., col., 2).

46.   Referring to claim 10, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses

polling the particular component or the particular two or more components to determine that the

state or state transition has occurred (e.g., col., 6).

47.   Referring to claim 11, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses

wherein the particular state or state transition is an illegal or undesired state (e.g., col., 6).

48.   Referring to claim 12, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses

wherein the step of specifying one or more states and state transitions comprises specifying

undesired states (e.g., col., 6).

49.   Referring to claim 13, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses

wherein the step of specifying one or more states and state transitions comprises specifying

illegal states and undesired states (e.g., col., 6).

50.   Referring to claim 14, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also .

discloses

wherein detecting whether a state or state transition has occurred comprises determining whether

a component or component interaction has entered an illegal or undesired state (e.g., col., 6).

51.   Referring to claim 15, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses

wherein an authorization violation and an authentication forgery are defined as illegal states

(e.g., col., 6).

52.   Referring to claim 16, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses wherein a sudden QoS degradation is defined as an undesired state (e.g., col., 6).

53.   Referring to claim 17, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses

examining multiple notifications to deduce one or more trends regarding the network (e.g., col.,

6).

54.   Referring to claim 18, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses

wherein the step of examining multiple notifications comprises examining notifications for

stable-behavior in a threshold value for a particular trend (e.g., col., 6).

55.   Referring to claim 19, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses wherein the step of examining multiple notifications comprises examining notifications

for increases or decreases in a threshold value for a particular trend (e.g., col., 6).

56.   Referring to claims 29 through 47, please refer to the rejections of the above-rejected

claims 1-19 for the rejections and the references. Moran also discloses a computer-readable

storage medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions for capturing illegal and

undesired behavior for network components and for interactions between components, which

instructions, when executed by one or more processors, cause the one or more processors to

carry out the steps.

57.   Referring to claim 20, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses

a computer based system for capturing illegal and undesired behavior for network components

and for interactions between components (e.g., col., 2), the system comprising: a network

component, each network component configured to spontaneously generate notifications when

specified states and state transitions occur involving the network component wherein the

specified state and state transitions (e.g., col., 6), include composite state transition (e.g., col., 6);

and a network management system configured to receive said spontaneously generated

notifications (e.g., col., 4).

58.   Referring to claim 21, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses

an agent configured to detect the generation of notifications by the network components (e.g.,

col., 2), and configured to report detected notifications to said network management system (e.g.,

col., 2)

59.   Referring to claim 22, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses

a state table configured to store said specified states and state transitions, including composite

state transitions (e.g., col., 2).

60.   Referring to claim 23, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses

wherein the state table is in a network management system (e.g., col., 2).

61.   Referring to claim 24, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses

wherein the state table is in a network component (e.g., col., 2).

62.   Referring to claim 25, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses

wherein the agent is further configured to examine condition of a network component and to

query the state table to determine whether the condition represents an illegal or undesired state

(e.g., col., 2).

63.   Referring to claim 26, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses

wherein the agent is further configured to examine a transition relating to a network component

and to query the state table to determine whether the transition represents an illegal or undesired

transition (e.g., col., 44).

64.   Referring to claim 27, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses

a system for capturing illegal and undesired behavior for network components and for

interactions between components (e.g., col., 2) comprising: a network component; an agent

configured to examine said network components to determine whether specified states, including

composite state transitions (e.g., col., 6), have occurred, wherein the agent is configured to

generate notifications upon a determination that a specified state has occurred (e.g., col., 2), and

wherein the agent is configured to report detected notifications to said network management

system (e.g., col., 2); and said network management system configured to receive reports of said

generated notifications (e.g., col., 4).

65.   Referring to claim 28, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses

a state log configured to store said specified states and state transitions, including composite state

transitions (e.g., col., 6).

66.   Referring to claim 1, Moran discloses a method for capturing illegal and undesired behavior for network components and for interactions between components (e.g., col., 2) comprising: specifying state and state transitions for a component (e.g., col., 5), wherein specifying includes specifying composite state transition; and if a said state occurs (e.g., col., 5), generating a notification corresponding to the specified state (e.g., col., 6).

67.   Referring to claim 2, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein said states are specified based on thresholds (e.g. col., 6).

68.   Referring to claim 3, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein the notification is an event (e.g., col., 17).

69.   Referring to claim 4, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein a state is a state of a component (e.g., col., 18), and wherein the step of generating the notification comprises generating the notification by the component (e.g., col., 18).

70.   Referring to claim 5, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein if the state relates to an interaction between components (e.g., col., 19), and wherein the notification is generated by a component involved in the interaction between the components (e.g., col., 19).

71.   Referring to claim 6, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses reporting the notification to a network management system (e.g., col., 21).

72.   Referring to claim 7, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses detecting whether a state has occurred (e.g. col., 22); and wherein if said step of

detecting detects that a state has occurred, said notification is generated in response to said step

of detecting (e.g., col., 22).

73.   Referring to claim 8, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses the step of detecting is performed by an agent (e.g., col., 44).

74.   Referring to claim 9, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses the agent is a dedicated agent (e.g., col., 44).

75.   Referring to claim 10, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses polling said components to determine whether a state or state transition has occurred

(e.g., col., 44).

76.   Referring to claim 11, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses wherein the step of specifying one or more states and state transitions comprises

specifying illegal states (e.g., col., 46).

77.   Referring to claim 12, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses wherein the step of specifying one or more states and state transitions comprises

specifying undesired states (e.g., col., 46)

78.   Referring to claim 13, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses wherein the step of specifying one or more states and state transitions comprises

specifying illegal states and undesired states (e.g., col., 46)

79.   Referring to claim 14, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses wherein detecting whether a state or state transition has occurred comprises

determining whether a component or component interaction has entered an illegal or undesired

state (e.g., col., 46).

80.   Referring to claim 15, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses wherein an authorization violation and an authentication forgery are defined as illegal

states (e.g., col., 46).

81.   Referring to claim 16, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses wherein a nongracefully QoS degradation is defined as an undesired state (e.g., table

2).

82.   Referring to claim 17, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses examining multiple notifications to deduce trends regarding the network (e.g., col., 45).

83.   Referring to claim 18, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses wherein the step of examining multiple notifications comprises examining notifications

for stable-behavior in a threshold value (e.g., col., 45).

84.   Referring to claim 19, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses wherein the step of examining multiple notifications comprises examining notifications

for increases or decreases in a threshold value (e.g., col., 45).

85.   Referring to claims 29 through 47, please refer to the rejections of the above-rejected

claims 1-19 for the rejections and the references. Moran also discloses a computer-readable

medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions for capturing illegal and undesired

behavior for network components and for interactions between components, which instructions,

when executed by one or more processors, cause the one or more processors to carry out the

steps (e.g., col., 5).

86.   Referring to claim 20, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses a system for capturing illegal and undesired behavior for network components and for

interactions between components (e.g., col., 2), the system comprising: a network component

configured to spontaneously generate notifications upon the occurrence of specified states and

state transitions (e.g., col., 5), including composite state transition; and a network management system configured to receive said spontaneously generated notifications (e.g., col., 6).

87.   Referring to claim 21, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses an agent configured to detect the generation of notifications by the network components, and configured to report detected notifications to said network management system (e.g., col., 17).

88.   Referring to claim 22, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses a state table configured to store said specified states and state transitions, including composite state transitions (e.g., col., 44).

89.   Referring to claim 23, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein the state table is in a network management system (e.g., col., 44).

90.   Referring to claim 24, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein the state table is in a network component (e.g., col., 44).

91.   Referring to claim 25, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also discloses wherein the agent is further configured to examine condition of a network component and to query the state table to determine whether the condition represents an illegal or undesired state (e.g., col., 44).

92.   Referring to claim 26, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses wherein the agent is further configured to examine a transition relating to a network

component and to query the state table to determine whether the transition represents an illegal

or undesired transition (e.g., col., 44).

93.   Referring to claim 27, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses a system for capturing illegal and undesired behavior for network components and for

interactions between components (e.g., col., 2) comprising: a network component (e.g., col., 5);

an agent configured to examine said network components to determine whether specified states

(e.g., col., 17), including composite state transitions, have occurred, wherein the agent is

configured to generate notifications upon a determination that a specified state has occurred (e.g.,

col., 6), and wherein the agent is configured to report detected notifications to said network

management system (e.g., col., 44); and a network management system configured to receive

reports of said generated notifications (e.g., col., 44).

94.   Referring to claim 28, Moran discloses the claimed rejected as above. Moran also

discloses a state log configured to store said specified states and state transitions, including

composite state transitions (e.g., col., 44).

Conclusion

95. The prior art made of record (forms PTO-892 and applicant provided IDS cited arts) and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Please see the IDS arts, Cisco Systems, Inc., entitled, "Cisco CNS Notification Engine SNMP Support Guide", #OL-3057-03, dated 7/29/03, (18 pgs); Cisco Systems, Inc., entitled, "Cisco CNS Notification Engine SNMP Support Guide for Release 3.0", #OL-3057-03, dated 3/20/03, (9 pgs); Cisco Systems, Inc., entitled, "Cisco IOS Software Releases 12.0 S, SNMP Support for VPNs", dated 3/6/03, (pgs. 1-13); Cisco Systems, Inc., entitled, "Cisco IOS Software Releases 12.0S, SNMP Notification Logging", dated 1/30/03, (pgs. 1-8); Cisco Systems, Inc., entitled, "Cisco CNS Notification Engine, Introduction to SNMP", dated 10/23/03, (pgs. 1-4), which are pertinent to the claimed subject matter of the claims.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers and/or paragraphs and/or

sections and/or page numbers in the reference(s) as applied to the claims above for the

convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings

of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages

and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing

responses, to fully consider the references in entirety, as potentially teaching, all or part of the

claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage, as taught by the prior art or disclosed by

the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3973. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to

8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HARESH PATEL

PRIMARY EXAMINER

December 4, 2007